

REMARKS

Counsel for applicants thanks Examiner Moy for the taking the time to speak with the undersigned about replying to the outstanding Office Action on November 19, 2003 and for returning earlier phone calls. Claims 1-8 and 18-19 are pending, and unelected claims have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Figure 11 of U.S. Patent Application Publication U.S. 2001/0029994 to Brown et al. ("Brown"). Claims 18-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,547,096 to Kleyn ("Kleyn"). Claims 2-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as obvious over Brown. It is respectfully submitted that the case is in condition for allowance over these documents and the prior art in general for the following reasons.

Brown does not anticipate or make obvious the claimed inventions since it does not have an outer fitting component that is bonded to the exterior of a container wall, and an inner fitting component that can be inserted into the interior of the outer fitting component to sandwich a portion of the container wall therebetween (recited in claim 1 as the "fitting portion"). These limitations of claim 1 result in a fuel tank fitting that maintains the structural continuity of the container wall into the fitting. This not only creates better reduced permeability characteristics for the container, but improves strength as well. Referring to Brown's Figure 11, there is no provision for sandwiching a portion of the container wall 214 into a gap between the inner component 204 and outer component 29d. Likewise, none of the other embodiments of Brown teach incorporation of the container wall between the inner and outer components to extend the impermeability characteristics of the container wall into the container fitting. In view

of this, Brown does not anticipate claim 1, and withdrawal of this basis for rejecting claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Brown does not make obvious dependent claims 2-8 either. There is nothing in Brown to suggest using the inner component to sandwich a portion of the outer component. In fact, Brown suggests the contrary by creating the fuel inlet first, followed by attachment of the fitting thereto. This is contrasted with the present invention where the outer fitting component is first bonded to the container wall, followed by using the inner fitting component to force the container wall between the inner and outer fitting components. The opening can then be formed or finished. Hence, Brown does not anticipate or make obvious any of the pending claims.

Kleyn does not fulfill any of the deficiencies of Brown. There is no fitting in Kleyn which sandwiches a fitting portion of the container wall between an inner and outer component wherein the fitting portion is continuous with the rest of the container wall. Hence, Kleyn does not anticipate or make obvious claims 18-19.

In view of the forgoing, withdrawal of the rejections and allowance is respectfully requested. If there are any reasons for not allowing the case, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned in order to discuss same and possibly expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,



Daniel B. Schein, Ph.D., Esq.
Registration No. 33,551
Attorney for Applicants

19 November 2003

Date

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. Box 10395
Chicago, IL 60610
Telephone: (408) 971-0627
Facsimile: (408) 971-0941